From: Faeth, Lisa [Faeth.Lisa@epa.gov]

Sent: 4/2/2015 3:59:23 PM

To: Allison, Rose [Allison.Rose@epa.gov]; Anderson, Steve [Anderson.Steve@epa.gov]; Austin, Kay

[Austin.Kay@epa.gov]; Berol, David [Berol.David@epa.gov]; Blunck, Christopher [Blunck.Chris@epa.gov]; Braxton,

Marilyn [Braxton.Marilyn@epa.gov]; Brinkhuis, Randall [Brinkhuis.Randall@epa.gov]; Buster, Pamela

[Buster.Pamela@epa.gov]; Canavan, Sheila [Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov]; Caraballo, Mario [Caraballo.Mario@epa.gov];

Christian, Myrta [Christian.Myrta@epa.gov]; Clark, Ellie [Clark.Ellie@epa.gov]; Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy [Cleland-Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov]; Corado, Ana [Corado.Ana@epa.gov]; Cunningham-HQ, Barbara [Cunningham-

HQ.Barbara@epa.gov]; Davies, Clive [Davies.Clive@epa.gov]; Dix, David [Dix.David@epa.gov]; Doa, Maria

[Doa.Maria@epa.gov]; Dougherty, Emily [Dougherty.Emily@epa.gov]; Dunton, Cheryl [Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov];

Ebzery, Joan [Ebzery.Joan@epa.gov]; Edelstein, Rebecca [Edelstein.Rebecca@epa.gov]; Eglsaer, Kristie

[Eglsaer.Kristie@epa.gov]; Farquharson, Chenise [Farquharson.Chenise@epa.gov]; Fehrenbacher, Cathy

[Fehrenbacher.Cathy@epa.gov]; Flattery, Priscilla [Flattery.Priscilla@epa.gov]; Fort, Felecia [Fort.Felecia@epa.gov];

Frank, Donald [Frank.Donald@epa.gov]; Giamporcaro, David [Giamporcaro.David@epa.gov]; Gibson, Hugh

[Gibson.Hugh@epa.gov]; Gimlin, Peter [Gimlin.Peter@epa.gov]; Gorder, Chris [Gorder.Chris@epa.gov]; Gordon,

Brittney [Gordon.Brittney@epa.gov]; Grant, Brian [Grant.Brian@epa.gov]; Hartman, Deborah

[Hartman.Deborah@epa.gov]; Henry, Tala [Henry.Tala@epa.gov]; Jones, Jim [Jones.Jim@epa.gov]; Kapust, Edna

[Kapust.Edna@epa.gov]; Kemme, Sara [kemme.sara@epa.gov]; Koch, Erin [Koch.Erin@epa.gov]; Krasnic, Toni

[krasnic.toni@epa.gov]; Lavoie, Emma [Lavoie.Emma@epa.gov]; Leczynski, Barbara [leczynski.barbara@epa.gov];

Leopard, Matthew [Leopard.Matthew@epa.gov]; Lewis, Paul [Lewis.Paul@epa.gov]; Lobar, Bryan

[Lobar.Bryan@epa.gov]; Mattheisen, Mike [Mattheisen.Mike@epa.gov]; Mclean, Kevin [Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov];

 $Moose, Lindsay \ [Moose.Lindsay@epa.gov]; \ Morris, Jeff \ [Morris.Jeff@epa.gov]; \ Moss, Kenneth \ Moose, Lindsay \ [Moose.Lindsay@epa.gov]; \ Morris, Jeff \ [Morris.Jeff@epa.gov]; \ Moss, Kenneth \ [Morris.Jeff@epa.gov]; \ Moss, Morris.Jeff@epa.gov]; \ Moss, Morris.Jeff@epa.gov]; \ Moss, Morris.Jeff@epa.gov]; \ Moss, Morris.Jeff@epa.gov]; \ Morris.Jeff$

[Moss.Kenneth@epa.gov]; Mottley, Tanya [Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov]; Myers, Irina [Myers.Irina@epa.gov]; Myrick, Pamela [Myrick.Pamela@epa.gov]; Nazef, Laura [Nazef.Laura@epa.gov]; Parsons, Doug [Parsons.Douglas@epa.gov];

Patel, Neil [Patel.Neil@epa.gov]; Penberthy, Ward [Penberthy.Ward@epa.gov]; Pierce, Alison

[Pierce.Alison@epa.gov]; Price, Michelle [Price.Michelle@epa.gov]; Reese, Recie [Reese.Recie@epa.gov]; Rice, Cody [Pierce.Alison@epa.gov]; Price, Michelle [Price.Michelle@epa.gov]; Reese, Recie [Reese.Recie@epa.gov]; Rice, Cody [Pierce.Alison@epa.gov]; Reese, Recie [Reese.Recie@epa.gov]; Rice, Cody [Pierce.Alison@epa.gov]; Rice, Cody [Pierce.Alison@e

[Rice.Cody@epa.gov]; Ross, Philip [Ross.Philip@epa.gov]; Sadowsky, Don [Sadowsky.Don@epa.gov]; Santacroce,

Jeffrey [Santacroce.Jeffrey@epa.gov]; Saxton, Dion [Saxton.Dion@epa.gov]; Saxton, June [Saxton.June@epa.gov];

Scarano, Louis [Scarano.Louis@epa.gov]; Schmit, Ryan [schmit.ryan@epa.gov]; Schweer, Greg

[Schweer.Greg@epa.gov]; Selby-Mohamadu, Yvette [Selby-Mohamadu.Yvette@epa.gov]; Seltzer, Mark

[Seltzer.Mark@epa.gov]; Shah, Aakruti [Shah.Aakruti@epa.gov]; Sherlock, Scott [Sherlock.Scott@epa.gov]; Shoaff,

John [Shoaff.John@epa.gov]; Simons, Andrew [Simons.Andrew@epa.gov]; Sirmons, Chandler

[Sirmons.Chandler@epa.gov]; Slotnick, Sue [Slotnick.Sue@epa.gov]; Stedeford, Todd [Stedeford.Todd@epa.gov];

Strauss, Linda [Strauss.Linda@epa.gov]; Suski, Jamie [Suski.Jamie@epa.gov]; Symmes, Brian

[Symmes.Brian@epa.gov]; Szilagyi, Maria [Szilagyi.Maria@epa.gov]; Tillman, Thomas [Tillman.Thomas@epa.gov];

Tran, Chi [Tran.Chi@epa.gov]; Vendinello, Lynn [Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov]; Wallace, Ryan [Wallace.Ryan@epa.gov];

Wheeler, Cindy [Wheeler.Cindy@epa.gov]; Widawsky, David [Widawsky.David@epa.gov]; Williams, Aresia

[Williams.Aresia@epa.gov]; Williamson, Tracy [Williamson.Tracy@epa.gov]; Wills, Jennifer [Wills.Jennifer@epa.gov];

Wise, Louise [Wise.Louise@epa.gov]; Wright, Denise [Wright.Denise@epa.gov]; Wright, Tracy

[Wright.Tracy@epa.gov]

Subject: News Articles (For EPA Distribution only)

BNA DAILY ENVIRONMENT REPORT ARTICLES

Canadian Assessments Propose Finding Two Forms of Trisiloxane Not Toxic

By <u>Peter Menyasz</u>

April 1 — Canada has proposed concluding that two forms of trisiloxane—known as MDM and M4Q—do not meet toxicity criteria and do not require regulatory action.

Final screening assessments of the substances concluded that they do not meet any of the criteria for toxicity in Section 64 of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, Environment Canada and Health Canada said in notices published March 28 in the Canada Gazette, Part I.

The substances were not considered high priorities for assessment under the government's Chemicals Management Plan, so were reviewed under a process to categorize substances on the Domestic Substances List under the Act, the departments said.

MDM—octamethyl-trisiloxane—is an organic substance primarily used to produce polydimethylsiloxane, which is used in cleaning and degreasing products, lubricants, cosmetics and diluents and solvents.

M4Q—1,1,1,5,5,5-hexamethyl-3,3-bis[(trimethylsilyl)oxy]-trisiloxane—is formed in low concentrations as an impurity during production of siloxane products including fillers, finishing agents, lubricants and lubricant additives, antifoaming agents and viscosity adjusters in paints and coating additives.

To contact the reporter on this story: Peter Menyasz in Ottawa at correspondents@bna.com

To contact the editor responsible for this story: Greg Henderson at ghenderson@bna.com

For More Information

The notice on MDM is available at http://bit.ly/1GdyJQ2.

The notice on M4Q is available at http://bit.ly/19G79xZ.

CORRECTION

An article in the April 1 report on the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia's ruling on a Freedom of Information Act request incorrectly said a final Integrated Risk Information System assessment of Libby amphibole asbestos had not been released (62 DEN A-8, 4/1/15). The EPA released the final IRIS assessment on Dec. 8, 2014 (237 DEN A-7, 12/10/14). The online version has been corrected.

INSIDEEPA.COM ARTICLES

Senate Budget Votes Hint At Hurdles To Beat Filibusters On Anti-EPA Bills

Senators' votes on fiscal year 2016 budget resolution amendments targeting EPA policies show the hurdles that the agency's critics face in securing 60 votes to beat likely filibusters over future bills to block EPA's climate rules and other measures, indicating the agency's Democratic supporters may succeed in stopping such legislation.

Environmentalists Fault TSCA Bill's High Bar For EPA Regulating 'Articles'

Environmentalists are criticizing language in a bipartisan Senate Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) reform bill they say would "hamstring" EPA's ability to regulate chemicals in "articles," or products, by requiring the agency to prove that consumers face "significant exposure" to harmful substances in articles before EPA could regulate them.

EPA Study Finds Increase In Scientific Integrity Activities, Investigations

EPA in a new report says efforts to bolster the integrity of science underpinning the agency's rulemakings and other work has increased even as allegations and investigations into a loss of integrity have also risen, as EPA works to implement the White House's push for agencies to improve the credibility of data that they use.

Toxicologists Push For EPA To Define 'Unreasonable' Risk In TSCA Reform

The Society of Toxicology (SOT) is recommending that pending Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) legislation be revised to include language requiring EPA to define a safety standard for the agency to review chemicals, saying there is longstanding confusion about the "no unreasonable risk" standard in current TSCA reform efforts.

EPA Rejects Industry Push To Reevaluate Cardiac Defects Risk From TCE

EPA has rejected an industry request to reevaluate its controversial conclusion that the solvent trichloroetheylene (TCE) causes cardiac birth defects and says multiple studies and agency science advisors back the risk, but one industry source says other advisors have opposed EPA's use of a controversial study supporting the conclusion.

Advocates Say EPA FracFocus Analysis Shows Need For Federal Database

Environmentalists are saying that EPA's analysis of data it took from the state-run FracFocus database for disclosure of chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing fluid underscores the need for a federal mandatory disclosure database, because the agency found gaps in the data where industry claimed it was confidential business information (CBI).

GREENWIRE ARTICLES

Senior executives angered by 'at will' employment changes

The federal government's elite career employees are troubled by prospects that Congress would allow them to be fired more easily.

In a <u>report</u> released today by the Senior Executives Association, members of the Senior Executive Service -- the top civil servants managing federal agencies and departments -- spoke out against changing their employment status to "at will." That would mean they could be fired without cause, stripping them of the due process and appeal rights they now have as federal employees.

CHEMICAL WATCH ARTICES

Echa issues two calls for comments and evidence

2 April 2015 / Europe

Echa has issued calls for comments and evidence on two substances undergoing regulatory processes for restrictions in specific uses.

The first one targets (3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,8-tridecafluorooctyl)silanetriol and any of its mono-, di- or tri-O-(alkyl) derivatives. Denmark is preparing a restriction dossier for polyfluorinated silanes in combination with one or more

organic solvents in aerosol spray cans sold to the general public. The objective of the call is to gather information from as many relevant interested parties as possible for the preparation of this dossier.

Comments are required by 28 May.

The second call targets lead and its compounds in articles supplied to the general public that can be mouthed by children. It is designed to collect information that would help clarify how the criteria defining the scope of the restriction apply to specific article types and subtypes. The deadline to provide input is 11 June.

Further Information

(3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,8-tridecafluorooctyl)silanetriol and any of its mono-, di- or tri-O-(alkyl) derivatives

Lead and its compounds

NGO confronts US FDA, Echa and Efsa over BPA

RISK questions clearance as agency poised to decide

2 April 2015 / North America, Risk assessment

A Brussels-based NGO has challenged the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the European Food Safety Agency (Efsa) and Echa to respond to "faults" in a 2008 study which is widely used to support the safety of bisphenol A (BPA).

The group Rebutting Industry's Science with Knowledge (RISK) maintains that a 2008 two-generation study of mice, which claimed to show no low-dose reproductive effects of BPA, is flawed. The study – Tyl et al 2008 – was conducted by contract research laboratory RTI International and sponsored by the chemical industry. It is a key piece of research supporting the continuing use of BPA.

The claimed faults aired by RISK echo those raised by 36 endocrine scientists, particularly Professor Fred vom Saal and John Peterson Myers, in the pages of *Environmental Health Perspectives* in 2009 and 2010. The papers (referenced below) involved a major debate about the OECD's Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) standard and whether it is suited to modern laboratory methods (GBB March 2012).

But the key reason for revisiting these disagreements is that Echa's Risk Assessment Committee (Rac) is currently considering whether restrictions are needed on the use of BPA in thermal paper (CW 19 March 2015). Rac must also decide whether it can support Efsa's recent position on the safety of BPA (CW 22 January 2015).

A key factor in the Tyl et al 2008 study is the size of the prostate glands in the control mice used in the experiment. Professor vom Saal and Dr Myers find that the glands were abnormally large, suggesting either that the dissection might have been done improperly, that the control animals might have been exposed to oestrogens, or that the prostates might have been diseased. They maintain that the results are invalid and indicate why the experiment did not demonstrate adverse effects of BPA at low doses.

The two scientists also claimed that the dose of the oestrogen positive control used in the experiment was very high. If these claims were correct, it would suggest the animals in the RTI laboratory were insensitive to oestrogen, perhaps

because they were exposed to other oestrogens through food, or even from a former fire involving plastics at the laboratory.

Tyl responded on two occasions to the critique, referring back to GLP and defending the methods used. She answered no fewer than 11 points. She provided material evidence of low rates of prostate disease and no dissection failures in microscope slides of the experimental animal tissues, and she claimed that the oestrogen levels used were not excessive.

However, critics still question the reliability and sensitivity of the 2008 study.

RTI International did not respond to *Chemical Watch's* request for comment on RISK's criticisms by the time of publishing. Echa says it will not comment on BPA while it is still under consideration by Rac.

The FDA says: "We note that the same claims mentioned in the press release were made in 2008 and 2009, when FDA released its 2008 draft assessment on BPA. In 2009 FDA audited the Tyl lab at the Research Triangle Institute. That audit came out clean."

Efsa acknowledges the debate surrounding the Tyl study, but says it had been found to be robust by the FDA and it had never been questioned by any regulatory agency including the Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN and the World Health Organization (FAO-WHO), the French food, environmental and occupational health agency Anses and the Danish Technical University. These last two organisations do, however, differ from Efsa on their assessments of the safety of BPA.

In a statement Efsa said that it has "held discussions with Anses on our respective assessments of BPA and agreed that most differences concern the interpretation of uncertainties regarding potential human health effects of BPA." It also published the minutes of its discussions on BPA with Anses in December 2014.

Philip Lightowlers

Further Information

Tyl et al 2008 study

Myers et al 2009 critique

Tyl 2009 response

vom Saal and Myers 2010 critique

Tyl 2010 response

Efsa, Anses BPA minutes

Echa Enforcement Forum agrees second authorisation pilot project

Group makes progress on coordinated restrictions inspection

2 April 2015 / Europe

Echa's Enforcement Forum will focus a second pilot project on the use of substances subject to authorisation (Annex XIV) with a sunset date before 2016. The project, agreed at the Forum's twentieth plenary meeting, will expand on the work of the first pilot, which ensured that substances subject to Annex XIV were not on the market without an authorisation (CW 13 November 2014).

Under the second project, inspectors will also check whether the authorisation holders comply with the conditions of the granted authorisation. Forum chairman Szilvia Deim says inspections will target manufacturers, importers, other suppliers and downstream users of substances subject to authorisation.

For example, she says, inspectors will be checking if an authorisation number is included in safety data sheets (SDS). Checks will also be carried out to ensure authorisations cover the whole supply chain, making sure a substance is not being used outside of its authorised uses. Results of the project are expected at the end of 2016.

In addition, the Forum has decided to select specific restriction entries for the fourth coordinated enforcement project (REF-4). Ms Deim says the list will include restrictions relevant to consumer articles, professional use and protection of the environment. The list will be published in the second quarter of 2015.

Once it is established, each member state will be able to choose restrictions from the list that are most relevant to their national priorities and market situation. Inspections will then take place during 2016 with the final report becoming available in 2017.

"This latest Forum meeting had two major agenda items; one on the enforceability of restrictions and the other on authorisation" says Ms Deim. She says talks regarding restrictions largely focused on how the Forum could effectively provide advice on the enforceability of a proposed restriction.

The meeting also had an initial brainstorming session on the challenges inspectors face in enforcing substance authorisation decisions issued by the Commission. However, Ms Deim says further discussions with the EU Commission and Echa are necessary in order to make progress on how to address these challenges.

In an update on the third coordinated enforcement project (REF-3), which has focused on REACH registration requirements, Ms Deim says that inspections were completed last year and that the Forum is working on the final report, which will summarise the findings of the project. The report will be published in the second half of 2015.

Leigh Stringer

Further Information

Echa press release

Scientists find transgenerational oestrogen effects in fish

BPA and EE2 exposure can affect future generations

2 April 2015 / North America, Risk assessment

Research by scientists from the University of Missouri has demonstrated that exposure of fish eggs to artificial oestrogens can have long term effects on fish populations.

A paper published in the journal *Nature* shows that developing medaka fish exposed to bisphenol A (BPA), or the artificial oestrogen ethinylestradiol (EE2) for seven days were not noticeably affected. There was also little effect on their offspring. However, the researchers found that the third and fourth generations, grown on from the treated ones – but not subject to any more chemical exposures – were adversely affected.

All of the exposed fertilised eggs hatched and the fish appeared normal. Results only began to appear in the third generation when the number of eggs fertilised was significantly reduced by 20-30% in both the BPA and the EE2 exposed lines. Embryo survival in the fourth generation was also significantly lower in both treatments compared to the control. The fertilisation rate of fourth BPA generation was significantly reduced and fifth generation embryo survival decreased significantly in both treatments.

The scientists note that the developing embryos are undergoing a crucial sex determination stage at the age of 5-7 days when oestrogen exposure appears to have set epigenetic markers. These have an adverse effect on the fertility of subsequent generations.

If such mechanisms occur in wild conditions, the authors note that fish populations inhabiting contaminated environments could be reduced.

Philip Lightowlers

Further Information

Paper

Echa expands scope of PACT tool

2 April 2015 / Europe

Echa's public activities coordination tool (PACT) table has been extended to include substances selected by authorities for hazard assessment.

Previously it included only substances for which a risk management option analysis (RMOA) was completed, or was in development.

The informal hazard assessment aims to make clear whether a substance has suspected PBT/vPvB (persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic/very persistent and very bioaccumulative) or endocrine disrupting properties.

The website's text has also been updated to provide further information on the table, and there is a glossary explaining its technical details.

Further Information

PACT-RMOA and hazard assessment activities

PBT expert group

Endocrine disruptor expert group

US groups seek ban on organohalogen flame retardant products

1 April 2015 / United States

A coalition of public interest groups has petitioned the US Consumer Product Safety Commission to ban four categories of consumer products if they contain any flame retardant in the chemical class known as organohalogens.

The categories are:

- children's products;
- furniture;
- mattresses; and
- casings around electronics.

The group says that this entire class of flame retardant chemicals has been associated with serious human health problems, including cancer, reduced sperm count, increased time to pregnancy, decreased IQ in children and impaired memory. "Nevertheless," they add, "the chemicals continue to be used at high levels in consumer products."

The petitioners are:

- · American Academy of Pediatrics;
- National Hispanic Medical Association;
- International Association of Fire Fighters;
- Learning Disabilities Association of America;
- Consumers Union;
- Consumer Federation of America;
- League of United Latin American Citizens;
- Kids in Danger;
- American Medical Women's Association;
- Philip J. Landrigan, M.D., M.P.H.

- · Worksafe; and
- Green Science Policy Institute.

The American Chemistry Council's North American Flame Retardant Alliance responded by saying that it is "unfortunate that these petitioners are presenting families with the false choice between chemical safety and fire safety when we can have both. Families should know that flame retardants can help provide strong protection against potentially devastating situations. They have been proven to be a critical component of fire safety and can help save lives."

Further Information

Petition

ACC release

US trade group wants improvements in EPA's risk assessments

1 April 2015 / United States

The US EPA needs to make further improvements to how chemical risk assessments are conducted, "particularly as they relate to identifying accurately the real world exposures and hazards presented from the chemicals evaluated," says the American Chemistry Council.

The ACC was reacting to the agency's plans to propose rules to ban or restrict the use of trichloroethylene (TCE), n-methylpyrrolidone (NMP) and methylene chloride in certain applications. The EPA is seeking input on the possible impact of the proposed rules on small businesses (<u>CW 31 March 2015</u>).

"No one benefits from regulatory actions that do not actually mitigate real risks," the group says, adding that the EPA "should also be clear on those substances that do not warrant full assessments, for example where problem formulation demonstrates a human health or environmental concern does not exist."

Saying it appreciates the EPA's willingness to discuss risk management measures with stakeholders before settling on regulatory action, the ACC says it supports the creation of small businesses panels to get more input for reducing potential risks. "This input, as well as refining how the assessments identify and address exposures, is vital to create a more effective approach to manage chemicals under the Toxic Substances Control Act."

Meanwhile, Faye Graul, executive director of the Halogenated Solvents Industry Alliance (HSIA) says it has been working with methylene chloride formulators and the Consumer Product Safety Commission on making "some changes in labelling that might address some of the concerns about risks for that application [that the EPA is targeting]".

Methylene chloride is the most effective paint removing substance, and although the HSIA offered to demonstrate it to the EPA at a meeting last December, Ms Graul says "they haven't taken us up on that opportunity yet." As for the other two substances: HSIA members only sell TCE to industrial customers and do not make NMP, she says.

Netherlands identifies hazardous substances in textiles

1 April 2015 / Netherlands, Textiles

A report on hazardous substances in textile products, prepared by the Netherlands National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), was discussed at a meeting of the European Commission's expert group on textiles, last week.

The report presents a prioritisation method for the assessment of hazardous substances that are registered under REACH and used in textiles. Prioritisation depends on the chemical's use, potency, and hazard classification under the CLP Regulation.

The paper identifies 788 individual substances; 32 of these – mostly dyes and flame retardants – were given the highest priority scores.

The RIVM hopes the method will be suitable to pinpoint high-priority substances registered under REACH. However, the report states that, first, a realistic exposure model is needed to perform a risk assessment for the compounds identified, as information available in the registration dossiers is not specific enough.

The European Apparel and Textiles Confederation (Euratex) and the International Dyes and Pigments Manufacturers Association (Etad) have welcomed the paper, saying it provides "a well-balanced approach" to assessing chemicals in textiles. The prioritisation method is "reasonable", they say, because it takes into account not only the classification of the substances but also additional aspects, such as toxicity and estimated consumer exposure.

Further Information

RIVM report

ETAD and Euratex statement

Japan to launch harmonised chemical database for Asean countries

Harmonised platform aims to facilitate information sharing

1 April 2015 / Japan, Risk assessment

Japan is working with the Association of Southeast Asia Nations (Asean) on a database that will provide a platform for information sharing on hazardous chemicals, associated regulations and risk assessment in the region.

Japan's Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (Meti) is launching a pilot version on 6 April, and a fully operational database is scheduled for April 2016. It is hoped the information in the database will serve as a basic regulatory framework in countries that have yet to establish chemicals management systems.

The Asean-Japan chemical safety database is an online platform that provides CAS numbers, GHS classification, hazard information, risk assessment results of chemicals and associated regulations in all Asean member states except Brunei.

The new system harmonises the existing data and information on hazardous substances in local chemicals management systems. Creating one universal system would allow companies to easily find necessary information in accordance with

the law of the supplying country, and help avoid compliance risks, Meti says. "From the government side, it will be an opportunity to know just how different systems for managing chemicals are in each country."

The main aim is to facilitate information transfer on hazardous chemicals and, by so doing, ensure the safer handling of such substances when importing and/or exporting among Japan and Asean countries. This will aid regions without a chemicals management system in place and will prevent duplicating testing on same substances.

Malaysia's Ministry of International Trade and Industry (Miti) says that, on a national level, the platform will enable companies to produce safer and higher quality products that meet international requirements whereas, on a regional level, it will help reduce non-tariff measures and facilitate international trade activities. "We also gathered some feedback from the industry associations who responded positively towards the initiative."

Cambodia says its Ministry of Industry and Handicraft has approved a principle to establish its own database system but a lack of resources is hindering implementation. "Cambodia imports chemicals from other countries and it is more affected by the use of chemicals, but the information and experiences [regarding chemicals management] are still limited in the private and public sectors. It strongly needs technical capacity improvement," says the ministry.

Currently, there are no plans to include other parts of Asia, such as South Korea and China, in the database. However, Malaysia's Miti is hoping the initiative will expand beyond the Asean region. "This database has the potential to be a game changer in the current chemical business landscape," the ministry adds.

A link to the database will be available on Meti's website on 6 April.

Aya Kawanishi

For more information on the platform, the reasons for implementation and comments from industry, see CW+AsiaHub

EU Commission reports on authorisation simplification progress

Implementing acts planned for low volume SVHCs and legacy spare parts

1 April 2015 / Europe

The European Commission is preparing implementing acts to simplify REACH authorisation for low volume substances and legacy spare parts (<u>CW 11 November 2014</u>).

The acts, which are expected to be tabled in the second half of the year, are just two of several measures the EU executive is considering to ease REACH authorisation in certain cases. It has been working in an authorisation taskforce with Echa and EU member states on a number of activities detailed in a paper presented at the latest meeting of the Competent Authorities for REACH and CLP (Caracal).

A public consultation on authorisation simplification runs until 30 April (CW 10 February 2015).

Low volume substances

The taskforce has been developing templates for low volume substance authorisation applications to demonstrate to applicants "the key and streamlined information to provide". What is considered to be a low volume is still to be agreed upon, and is part of the consultation.

Legacy spare parts

Regarding SVHCs used in the repair of long life articles – legacy spare parts – the Commission says that "the solution that seems to have the broadest acceptance among all stakeholders is a simplification of the assessment of alternatives (AoA) and of the socio-economic analysis (SEA) in the application for authorisation." Through the public consultation, the EU executive hopes to collect more information on what substances are used in these spare parts and, when possible, the volumes used.

The sunset date of some substance uses will pass before the planned implementing act has been adopted. For these cases, the Commission intends to extend the sunset dates specifically for legacy spare part uses of the Annex XIV substances concerned (CW 5 January 2015), until the implementing act is applied.

Simplified AoA and SEA templates will also be developed for substances used in legacy spare parts.

Other special cases

The Commission is looking into other cases where authorisation streamlining is necessary. These are:

- articles that require recertification or re-approval under EU legislation if their composition is changed, such as those used in the aerospace and automotive sectors. Here it is looking to align the authorisation review period with the recertification schedule; and
- uses with high socio-economic values, or substances considered "biologically essential", such as pharmaceuticals, may also be considered for a simplified authorisation procedure.

Streamlining general applications

Going beyond these specific cases, the Commission says it is necessary to look at possibilities of streamlining all applications in general, and it proposes to look into:

- the level of information required to demonstrate exposure below the derived no-effect level (Dnel), for authorisation applications trying to prove adequate control, or minimising exposure, when adequate control of a substance's risks cannot be demonstrated;
- possibilities to use data derived from workplace legislation (<u>CW 24 March 2015</u>);
- situations where the substance is not present in the final article; and
- the socio-economic analysis necessary for "clear, very high socio-economic value" regarding the use of an SVHC.

The taskforce may continue working to simplify and customise the AoA, SEA and chemical safety report (CSR) templates by indicating "which type of information is needed as a minimum to prove the case," the Commission says in the paper.

The EU executive also presented a second paper to Caracal addressing comments submitted by member states and other interested parties regarding the simplification and streamlining of authorisation. The Commission says authorisation simplification is targeting particular cases, where the risks from using substances are small or decreasing over time. It adds that streamlining aims to reduce the burden of preparing some parts of the application and, subsequently, the work for authorities, in cases where the substance cannot, for the time being, be substituted.

Eurometaux welcomes the Commission's plans, and calls for process chemicals, recycling materials, packaging and reformulation uses to be considered as well.

"For us, a fit-for-purpose dossier is the most effective measure to be taken," says Tatiana Santos, senior policy officer for chemicals and nanotechnology at the European Environmental Bureau (EEB). But the best way to simplify the authorisation process, she says, is to promote substitution, which in turn would decrease the number of applications for authorisation. The Commission and Echa should do more on that, Ms Santos adds.

Carmen Paun

Further Information

Commission paper on authorisation simplification

Responses to stakeholders

Eurometaux press release

EU group reveals assessment system for indoor emissions

1 April 2015 / Europe

A team of member state authorities, industry and research organisations has published a procedure to establish health-protective limits for indoor emissions from construction products.

The procedure, based on toxicological and risk assessment principles, is used to assess the potential risks to health arising from inhalation exposure to volatile organic compounds (VOCs). It uses the lowest concentration of interest (LCI) concept, which was also adopted under the German Committee for Health-related Evaluation of Building Products (AgBB) scheme and the French protocol for the same purpose.

So far the team – the EU-LCI working group – has derived LCI values for 83 compounds, including:

- ethylbenzene;
- toluene;
- · alpha pinene;
- hexanal;
- styrene;
- caprolactam; and
- naphthalene.

These are now publicly available on a website dedicated to the project. The list will be updated as new limits are derived, according to group member, Christine Däumling from the German Federal Environment Agency (UBA).

Once the work is completed, it will list values for a total 185 VOCs commonly detected in emission tests on construction materials. This list was consolidated through the assessment of indoor quality in various types of buildings, including schools, offices and dwellings.

The EU-LCI working group was established by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC) in 2011, when the harmonisation of the health based evaluation of emissions from building products in indoor air was incorporated into the Commission's Health Directorate's strategy on indoor air quality. Working under the JRC's umbrella the team developed a roadmap for a harmonised framework for evaluating indoor emissions from construction (<u>CW 11 February 2014</u>).

Since 2013 EU funding for the project has run out, but the group has continued working under its own steam. The team is hoping for a new mandate from the EU executive soon to support its work going forward. Given new financial support, the full list of compounds could be available within three years, Ms Däumling says.

Once finalised, the intention is to adopt and apply the EU-LCI procedure across Europe. Currently, the available values have been adopted in the existing national schemes established by the German AgBB, and the Belgian decree on indoor emissions.

Members of the EU-LCI working group include experts from nine European countries, drawn from government organisations such as the UBA, and France's Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety (Anses), as well as industry representatives, including the European Chemical Industry Council (Cefic), research institutes and universities.

The group's next meeting, funded by the UBA, is due to take place in June.

Further Information

EU-LCI website

OTHER ARTICLES

Stop Playing 'Whack-A-Mole' With Toxic Flame Retardants, Health Advocates Urge

Huffington Post

As the public has learned of health risks tied to **chemicals** in everyday ... "We're playing **toxic** whack-a-mole," said Arlene Blum, a chemist at the ...

County ranks 10th in chemical release

YourGV.com

Virginia industries reported 868 million pounds of chemicals managed ... "Virginia's overall trend in releases of **toxic chemicals** continues to decline," ...

EPA Report Finds Nearly 700 Chemicals Used in Fracking

EcoWatch

fracking The report has been heavily criticized for its reliance on a voluntary reporting system and for not probing deep enough into the **toxicity** of these ...

Toxic materials get new life through household hazardous waste collection

Florida Times-Union

The **chemicals**, oils, paints, appliances and other wastes that Jacksonville residents turn in during Household Hazardous Waste and E-Waste Mobile ...

Gattefossé to develop cosmetics actives with green technology in exclusive deal

CosmeticsDesign-Europe.com

This is where the NaDES technology steps in as it fully represents **green chemistry** principles. Back in 2013, a group of scientists in The Netherlands ...